

## REMARKS

### Interview Summary

On 06/01/04 the applicant engaged in a telephone interview with the examiner. In preparation for the interview, the applicant faxed the examiner remarks which are duplicated verbatim below. The telephone interview lasted only a few minutes wherein the examiner indicated that in view of the remarks the application would be allowed.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7-9, and 14 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Gudesen (5,761,607) in view of the examiner taking official notice. The examiner asserts that Gudesen discloses a random access storage device for storing an encrypted video program in encrypted segments. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Although Gudesen discloses to store video programs in an encrypted form, Gudesen does not disclose to store a single video program in encrypted segments, or a decoder for randomly and independently decrypting each encrypted segment. Further, Gudesen discloses no motivation for encrypting a single video program in segments. Referring to page 4, lines 14-22, of applicant's specification:

“The DVR 1 of FIG. 1 further comprises a video controller 28 for receiving video data 30 from an external entity (e.g., a cable or satellite) and for providing video data 34 to a display device during playback. The video controller 28 processes the headers in the video frames of the video data 30 in order to implement trick play features. Certain trick play features, such as skip ahead or behind, require that the video program be accessed randomly rather than in a consecutive sequence of frames. The DVR 1 of FIG. 1 facilitates this feature by decrypting the video program in segments. When the video controller 28 requires access to a particular

segment of the video program, it initializes the decoder 26 with an appropriate segment key for decrypting the video segment as it is read from the RAS device 3.”

Nothing in Gudesen suggests the above benefit, or any benefit for encrypting/decrypting a video program in segments. The rejection should therefore be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The examiner indicated during the telephone interview held on 06/01/04 that the application would be allowed in view of the foregoing remarks. The examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned over the telephone in order to resolve any remaining issues that may prevent the immediate allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/9/04

By: Howard H. Sheerin

Howard H. Sheerin

Reg. No. 37,938

Tel. No. (303) 765-1689

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on:

7/9/04

(Date)

Howard H. Sheerin

(Print Name)

Howard H. Sheerin  
(Signature)